

REMARKS

Claims 30-31, 33-40, 42-43, 45-51 have been amended in this response. Claim 41 has been cancelled. Claims 30-31, 33-40, 42-52 are under examination. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 30-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Christensen et al.*, U.S. Patent 5, 881,230 (hereinafter *Christensen*) and *Lanteigne et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,557,056 (hereinafter *Lanteigne*) in view of *Mathur et al.*, U.S. Patent 6,704,807 (hereinafter, *Mathur*). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On August 14, 2007, Ronald M. Pomeranke, representative for the Applicants, conducted a telephonic Examiner interview with Examiner Philip C. Lee. Claim 30 was discussed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection over *Christensen et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,881,230 (hereinafter, *Christensen*) in view of other references. A proposed amendment to Claim 30 was discussed. No definitive agreements were reached. The Applicants thank the Examiner for granting this interview.

REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 30 - 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Christensen* in view of *Lanteigne et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,557,056 (hereinafter, *Lanteigne*) in

further view of *Mathur et al.*, U.S. Patent 6,704,807 (hereinafter, *Mathur*). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended Independent Claim 30 recites:

the plurality of first processes exchanging data with the first proxy via shared memory, wherein each of the plurality of first processes is assigned a unique region of the shared memory, and wherein a virtual device driver is associated with each unique region, and
wherein exchanging data with the first proxy includes, for each first process of the plurality of first processes:
the each first process writing data to the respective unique region assigned to the each first process, and the first proxy reading data from the respective unique region assigned to the each first process; and
the first proxy writing data to the respective unique region assigned to the each first process, and the each first process reading data from the respective unique region assigned to the each first process;
wherein each first process reads from and writes to its respective unique region under regulation of the virtual device driver that is associated with the respective unique region; and wherein the first proxy reads from and writes to the respective unique regions under regulation of one or more virtual device drivers.

The combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest these limitations.

Support for this claim amendment may be found in the Specification at least at page 5, line 12 – page 6, line 19. No new matter has been added.

Lanteigne's queuing system does not have virtual device drivers associated with different slots in the queue (note that the slots are not assigned to processes). Nor does *Lanteigne* teach that processes read and write to slots in the queue under regulation of a virtual device driver that is associated with the respective slots in the queue. Therefore, *Lanteigne* fails to teach or suggest, “wherein each first process reads from and writes to its respective unique region under regulation of the virtual device driver that is associated with the respective unique region”, as claimed.

Neither *Christensen* nor *Mathur* remedy this deficiency. Therefore, Claim 30 is allowable.

Claim 42 recites similar limitations to those discussed in the remarks regarding Independent Claim 30. Therefore, Independent Claim 40 is allowable over Morshed and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

CLAIM 40

Independent Claim 40 recites, in part:

- a plurality of process virtual device drivers, at least one virtual device driver being assigned to each first slot to regulate data flow into and out of the first slots of the shared memory;
- a plurality of proxy virtual device drivers, each proxy virtual device driver corresponding to one of the process virtual device drivers;
- ...
- wherein each process virtual device driver is configured to cooperate with the corresponding proxy virtual device driver to regulate data being inputted to and outputted from the corresponding first slot.

For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 30, Claim 40 is allowable.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The remaining claims depend from one of Claims 30, 40, or 42, and are therefore allowable. Moreover, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 15, 2007

/RonaldMPomerence#43009/

Ronald M. Pomerence

Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, #550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080, ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076